R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 594 24

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FAIR CATEGORIES. APPENDIX B.

BY- HANDY, RICKY AND OTHERS

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0249-5 PUB DATE 12 NOV 65

CONTRACT OEC-6-10-108

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.04 26P.

DESCRIPTORS- *BEHAVIOR RATING SCALES, SOUND FILMS, *INTERACTION PROCESS ANALYSIS, GROUP DYNAMICS, *MICROTEACHING, *STUDENT TEACHERS, TEACHER EVALUATION, *FILMS, AUSTIN, AMIDON FLANDERS INTERACTION SCALE

A TRANSCRIPTION WAS MADE OF A GROUP DISCUSSION CONDUCTED TO DEVELOP A SCALE FOR MAKING QUANTIFIED RATINGS OF THE INTERACTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS AND PUPILS AS OBSERVED FROM A FILM OF A 15-MINUTE LESSON PRESENTED BY THE STUDENT TEACHER. THE INTERACTIONS WERE TO BE JUDGED ON THE BASIS OF THE AMIDON-FLANDERS INTERACTION ANALYSIS SCALE, AND A NEW SCALE, CALLED THE FILM ANALYSIS OF INTERACTION RECORD (FAIR), WAS TO BE DEVELOPED TO ENABLE OBSERVERS TO MAKE AND RECORD QUICK, QUANTITATIVE JUDGMENTS OF THE BEHAVIORS OBSERVED FROM THE FILM. DISCUSSIONS WERE MADE ON THE NUANCES INVOLVED IN ASSIGNING RATINGS IN SUCH CATEGORIES AS "ACCEPTS FEELING," "PRAISES AND ENCOURAGES," AND "LECTURES." RELATED REPORTS ARE AA 000 026 THROUGH AA 000 031. (AL)

BR-5-0249-5
OEC-6-10-108

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B, P.A. 24

The Development of FAIR* Categories.

Group meeting of Friday, November 12, 1965
Present: Ricky Handy, Don Melcer, Sheila Whitesides, Beulah Newlove, Lynn Jackson, Jeanne Amacker, and Pat Baldwin

Ricky: What we're going to talk about now is our rating scale and the development of each of the categories in the Amidon Flanders Interaction Scale, and we're going to start with the first one, "accepts feeling." I think the first thing we did with that was to change from a number 1 to the letter 'F". And I don't remember our original definition of this category; I remember how I changed it, indirectly, but I don't remember where we started with it. Did we start just as it was here (Amidon Flanders scale)?

Don M: Yes, we started with the AF scale on all of them, and Frances had added something down here in the "student response", and that was all.

Ricky: Yeah.

Don: She had added "student talk response" plus the "enthusiastic response".

Ricky: We defined that as "enthusiasm" later, didn't we?

Don: Uh-huh. She had written in there as enthusiasm to start with.

Ricky: Yeah.

Lynn: We also had "content relevant" and "content irrelevant".

Don: Yeah, which we disregarded.

Ricky: ... which we couldn't handle. So on "accepts feeling" then, the first change was when I said that I felt this should reflect a very high level of therapeutic response on the teacher's part, in which she accepted the student's feeling on a very one-to-one, I-thou sort of relationship. I was defining it very much in terms of therapy. And then how did it change - how did it come about?

*Film Analysis of Interaction Record

AA000028
ED011594

Sheila: With the "starfish girl", because they were seated at a table and the little boy had his back to us in the film, and we couldn't see him, but she must have seen his face. And all of a sudden she stopped, and she said, "Johnny," or whatever his name was, "...you want to say something?", or something like that.

Sheila: Yes, "Do you want to say something?" and she stopped, and she gave him an opportunity to talk, and we felt then that she'd accepted his feeling that he wanted to talk and we said then that something like that would be "accepts feelings," something a little lower than therapy.

Ricky: Yeah, and then I talked to Frances about my definition, and she said, "Oh, no, the top of this scale is not the best teacher behavior and the bottom of it the poorest teacher behavior; it's just different behaviors, and there is no value attached to these ratings." And she gave the example that "accepts feeling" could be a teacher accepting the feeling that a class was confused and that this could lead to total confusion in the classroom, and that this would be a bad kind of thing, but that we'd still rate it "accepts feeling." So that we weren't making good-bad judgments; we were just making interaction judgments. So we moved AF back on a level of interaction and as far as we were concerned it was just another kind of response. This wasn't a scale, having a top and bottom. And then, Don, you added something to this category, didn't you ...much later?

Don: Well, I think this goes down in another category...

Ricky: I mean in our final writing of it, your idea wound up here:

Don: Yeah, this was the category which Amidon Flanders calls 3, which

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ended up as "accepts ideas" or "I" on our scale. This started off as a very broad category, and we narrowed it down to the fact that just accepting anything a student put out, a statement or ...

Ricky: ...response..

Don: ..response. We scored this "I". And we put the hearing and accepting of a real idea and the incorporating of the idea back up into the category of "accepting feeling" as a higher category of accepting ideas.

Ricky: uh-huh. So then we included in accepting feeling whenever the teacher recognized and related to creativity - creative thinking on the student's part.

Pat: That's right, that's right.

Ricky: And our example here was with the arithmetic teacher with the beads.

Don: Uh-huh.

Ricky: And do you remember the example?

Don: Yes, Johnny got that right...he did this, he did this, he did this. Do you see how he got that, class?

Ricky: Yeah, so now we would rate that "F", rather than "I". And this was added to this first category, "accepts feeling." Now is that where it is now?

Don: Uh-huh.

Pat: Probably in actual rating, we'd give that an "I", "F", wouldn't we?

Ricky: No, we'd give it an "F", a straight "F".

Don: That's a good point. Don't you remember, we've come down now to

where there are no combinations for anything, in other words, each spot has to have a category.

Pat: Oh, what I was thinking was that when something like this really happened, you would first see her say "That's right Johnny," and you might give this an "I"; and then, as it happened on the film, it might most likely be that you would see an "I" and an "F".

Don: Oh, I see; you didn't mean a combination of ratings...

Pat: No, I didn't mean you'd rate a combination. I just meant that you'd probably have an "I" followed by an "F" if something like that really did happen.

Ricky: Well, you might have..if it took you that long to recognize what the teacher was doing...

Pat: Yeah, that's right.

Ricky: Now, are we settled on that?

Pat: Uh-huh.

Ricky: All right, "praises or encourages", we changed first from the number to a "P", and then to the letter "N", standing for encourages.

Jeanne: "Nurtures."

Ricky: Nurtures? Oh.

Sheila: Oh, I was always thinking of it as "encouages."

Pat: Well, I think we've been thinking of it in both ways.

Ricky: Yeah, and why did we change from "P"?

Pat: Because we saw praise so seldom - real praise.

Don: Yeah, it ended up this way..."encourages, shows warmth by speech, etc., etc., etc.

Sheila: Oh-oh, that reminds me of a problem we came into.

Ricky: Are we really using it that much?

Various negatives...

Pat: I use quite a few "N's".

Ricky: I mean, are we using them with "uh-huh"?

Don: Well, in the sense that a student makes a response and the teacher says uh-huh, as if she <u>meant</u> it...

Sheila: But then we ran into the problem of all right, ok, as being transitional between two of her ideas and we decided that you have to decide for yourself whether she means it or whether she's just moving.

Pat: Yeah. You have three areas - you have one of them where it would be "N" for "encouragement" in an "uh-huh" or an "all right." Ok, then you have an area in the middle, where you wouldn't rate at all, because you feel it's <u>traveling</u>*...

Ricky: Right.

Pat: And then the other area would be "I" for ideas or accepting ideas.

Ricky: Yeah, let's see if we can think of examples. Does anybody remember an "N", a genuine "N", they've given lately?

Beulah: That wasn't what I was thinking about, but that might be "that's right."

Ricky: That might be "I", to say "that's right" - it might be accepting ideas. What if she says, "Good."

Don: It would depend on the context.

Ricky: Yeah, that's right.

Pat: It's very hard to just sit here and think of one...

*"Traveling" is a coined word meaning anything the teacher does to get where she plans to go whether it connects with the class or not, even if the words used sound like another category.

Ricky: Uh-huh.

Don: Here's an hypothetical one. The teacher asks for an answer to a question, and the student responds with some content material that is correct. And she says, "That's right"! That would be an "I". If the student is asked for something and gives an opinion and then expresses his own feelings about this and then the teacher responds with "uh-huh", then it would be an "N".

Sheila: If it's a true uh-huh.

Lynn: There is an "N" on that film, U319, which is the last one we really looked at.

Ricky: I don't remember.

Sheila: There was a perfect example of "accepts feeling" in that film. The little boy came up and didn't want to read - remember?

Ricky: Yes, that's a good example. She said, "Would you like me to read it?"

Sheila: Yeah. And she let him go back to his seat.

Pat: She didn't even tell him to go back to his seat.

Ricky: No, that's right.

Pat: She just took over for him.

Ricky: And we all felt that that was a true "F". How about if a child says something in class, like in the starfish film, with that teacher, and she says, "That's interesting." Is that "I", or is that "N"? Is that the kind of "N" we're looking for? (general agreement)

Don: It seems that "I" has kind of gotten down to a mundane response which simply meant that, rather than totally ignoring what the kid says,

she either says ok, or all right, or repeats what the kid's just said, then moves right on without very much quality or emotional involvement at all.

Pat: Except that it's not as flat as just traveling.

Don: Yeah.

Pat: It's just a different kind of a level, and then "enthusiasm" is when there's more enthusiasm in her voice, or where she smiles at him bigger, and all these things that you get when you're watching the film.

Don: Uh-huh.

Ricky: I guess that when she asks a question and a child gives a correct response, and then maybe elaborates it a little, or something, and she says, "Good, good," we'd give that an "N"; whereas if she says, "Well, Johnny says so, and so, what else do we know?", we'd give that an "I". In other words, she gave some acceptance to his idea.

Pat: That's good. And these are good examples to give.

Ricky: An "I" is when she puts a stamp of approval on the <u>idea</u>; an "N" is putting a stamp of approval on the <u>kid</u>, or on his presentation of something, and an "F" is when she responds to his feeling without using an idea or anything else, but it's more immediate. Uh? There's an immediacy about "F", in her having caught something..

All: Yeah.

Beulah: What about when a teacher looks at a little boy and says, after he's answered and answered and answered, "Lester, you can't answer this one."

Pat: That's a "C".

Beulah: No, it wasn't a "C". He'd answered and answered and answered, and she'd responded to him, but there were other hands up, and she said, "Lester, you can't answer this one."

Pat: Did she mean, "I don't want you to answer any more?"

Beulah: She meant, you've already answered a lot and you're just the smartest thing, but...

Sheila: Let someone else try it.

Pat: Well, she's trying to change his behavior. That's a "C".

Beulah: But he was smiling tremendously...

Pat: Well, that's all right, she's setting limits..

Ricky: Oh, you're (to Beulah) saying this is an "N".

Beulah: See, what actually happened... I'm asking you what it is. The child was <u>delighted</u> with her response.

Don: Yeah.

Beulah:... she wanted him to hush...but she was smiling ear-to-ear, and he was tickled out of his mind... but she wouldn't call on him that time.

Pat: It looks like a "C" to me.

Lynn: Remember, there's no value judgment in a "C".

Pat: Yeah, I think that's right. When we're saying that a "C" implies coldness, well, then, we're value judging...

Ricky: That's right. And if we're saying that "I" is "low level", then we're implying a directionality to this scale that isn't there.

Sheila: So it'd be a "C".

Ricky: Yeah. So "encouraging" or "accepts feeling" could be in regard to hostility, huh?

Pat: Oh, yeah.

Don: Sure.

Ricky: If the child is very angry, and the teacher says, "Boy, you're really mad, aren't you?" - this is "F".

Don: Yeah. Ya'll have gone past "C", and I'm trying to hold up the flag there, because we had agreed, at one time or another, that "C" was a criticizing response, or justified her own authority, or made any response which otherwise... including hostile, cold, or witholding.

Ricky: Yeah, this is what I have trouble with...

Don: ... bawling someone out, stating why the teacher is doing what she's doing...

Ricky: Well, Frances says we've got to use this non-directional, and knock out anything here that is directional. In other words, she thinks that criticizing is sometimes <u>the thing</u> that the teachers ought to do to maintain structure in this situation, and that a teacher who...

Don: Well, then, coldness and hostility is not always inappropriate.

Pat: Yeah, just like, well...I don't know...a lot of times kids are just happier when limits are set for them.

Ricky: Yeah.

Pat: And you change their behavior.

Lynn: Well... change of behavior...is that in that now?

Ricky: Yeah.

Don: Well, it seems like the example you gave would be an "F", because the teacher accepted his feelings, and she's handling them in a very non-threatening manner, such that the child's behavior was such that he

didn't look hurt, he didn't look unhappy, so she did a fine job of accepting feelings in a non-threatening manner, then went on to something else.

Lynn: So it wouldn't be a "C", it'd be an "F".

Don: It'd be an "F".

Ricky: At the same time, I see Pat's point.

Sheila: Yeah, I think I do, too...

Ricky: If there's no directionality to this scale..

Pat: It's a "C".

Sheila: It's a nice "C"!

Ricky: She's just saying you're not going to take over the class.

Don: Well...I don't know...

Ricky: I don't know either, but..

Don: ...the frame of reference that I've got is that she handled this by accepting feeling, by the "F" scale that we've set up here. If she had handled this by using criticism, or any kind of a cold, hostile remark, then this would be ok, too, but then you would give this a "C".

Ricky: You mean, if she had said, "Johnny, you've talked all hour; now there are other people in this class...

(Laughter)

Don: Uh-huh, then that's a "C". This would be a different way of handling it.

Pat: Nooo-because you know what I think, I think that if he'd been answering these questions all along and he kind of...he was going along wanting to answer some more questions, and he would have, had she not

stopped him. Oh, he would have answered more questions had she not stopped him...he might not have been even aware, on a conscious level, that he would like to be stopped.

Don: Uh-huh.

Pat: She did it in a nice way and she has a good relationship with the kid, she respects him and everything like this, but... I guess what I always refer back to when I think of criticism is the change in behavior; and this to me does not imply, necessarily, an attack upon another person..

Ricky: No...

Pat: So...

Ricky: But by this definition, see, it says "cold, hostile behavior."

Beulah: Well, if I say to Lynn, for instance, oh, come on and tell me about your trip to Paris, you're the only one who went there.

Pat: You're encouraging...

Beulah: I'm encouraging, I'm not criticizing. I'm trying to change your behavior, you're not talking, and I'm trying to get you to talk.

Lynn: What about constructive criticism?

Don: This would be in our "C" category.

Jeanne: But what's the difference between constructive and malicious?

Don: Well, this is what Ricky's saying, that we're not to imply this kind of thing in our ratings.

Ricky: Supposedly the scale is not directional. In other words, a good teacher lectures, a good teacher accepts feelings; a bad teacher lectures and accepts feelings. In other words, no one of these things designates a good teacher.

Beulah: And a good teacher criticizes?

Ricky: And a good teacher criticizes....

Jeanne: Well, what's going to come out of our reports, then?

Ricky: All we're doing is offering one section to the whole study, and this is an interaction - we're not rating these teachers good-bad; that's been done.

Jeanne: Already?

Ricky: Uh-huh.

Sheila: Oh yeah, they've already come and gone.

Lynn: So that we want to see what kinds of combinations of interactions go with good and bad teachers.

Ricky: Yeah.

Don: See, they're predicting from this to this. If we use a non-directional scale...then, of course what we're saying is that we still don't actually agree upon all of these categories.

Ricky: Yeah.

Don: But, then, I think this is the variable, that we're trying to stick in direction.

Ricky: You see, if we start rating these teachers as good teacher or bad teachers, all we're doing is repeating the work that's already been done. That's been done.

Jeanne: Well, actually though, this particular type of judgment would reflect to me the quality of a teacher that would be valuable. In other words, it's not so much the percentage of the interaction, but the quality of the interaction...in other words, was she a backbiting sort of

a person, or was she a constructive person.

Ricky: But that isn't supposed to be part of our judgment.

Don: Yeah. This is where we have the TAF scale, where we go from positive to negative on the various ranges...

Pat: You don't get this on the individual ratings...

Jeanne: Well, I still don't understand exactly what this - the interaction - is going to bring out and prove.

Don: Oh.

Ricky: Just an interaction?

Lynn: Because, huh, the pattern of q, e, q, e, f, f, such and such goes with being rated a good teacher; the pattern l, q, q, r, goes with being rated a bad teacher. All this is...you can't...

Sheila: It's the over-all pattern; you can't tell anything from one individual rating.

Don: Here's - on the Amidon Flanders - in the back of that, they have actually taken some real ratings and worked them out and have produced grids in which certain teachers will show responses grouped in various areas over a long period of time. For example, Area B - accepts feelings and praise, you may have a teacher who does a lot of this, then you can compare this, or predict from your stuff to this or viceversa, and that's what's being done.

Sheila: You know how far I've gone thinking about this being an evaluation - you know, good or bad - when I taught that class at Porter? At one time, I thought "I would get all Q's and R's on this; it's gonna look bad. I thought this. Because I was asking questions, and I thought

sure will be a lot of q's and r's and not many e's and v's.

Ricky: Uh-huh.

Sheila: It just came to me that I was doing that. I was standing back and saying, well, this girl has a lot of q's and not much else.... and it was me.

Ricky: Uh-huh. Well, that example Frances gave of accepting feeling being disrupting to the classroom is what got the directionality out of that scale for me.

Don: Uh-huh.

Ricky: Because I was so convinced the other way. And then, with that one example, I really...

Pat: Well, this is the way we usually think; we usually think of accepting feeling as being good, and we usually think of criticizing as being bad. And maybe most of the time this is the way it is, but...

Ricky: But we've got to keep it out to the extent...

Pat: That's not...

Ricky: Well, let's try to think of an example of traveling now. We have examples, of "F", "N", now an example of traveling. Is it huh-huh, good, all right, or what? And she's just getting on to the next thing.

Pat: A good example would be after she had maybe had some children pass out some papers, and they gave them back to her and she said, "all right, now.." like that.

Ricky: Uh-huh.

Pat: And we don't score it.

Ricky: And that's really traveling.

Don: The question we have here is when to rate it and when not to rate it.

Pat: And it's very subjective.

Don: Yeah, it's real subjective. The only thing that's present as a cue sometime is if the teacher says uh-huh and still obviously isn't concentrating on the student, or if she...or if the student gives the response and she breaks off from him, and the uh-huh is just sort of figuratively looking away like... into something in the future...

Ricky: Yeah.

Don: You know, like she'd say, Johnny, what's the answer to this, and he gives the answer, and she looks at him and says uh-huh and then goes back to the stuff, or if she goes beck to this and says uh-huh...

Ricky: Yeah, well that second one is traveling, and we don't rate it. Because, for one thing, it gums us up all to pieces, because, for one thing, usually this is followed immediately by something else, and your letters begin to pile up...

Don: Uh-huh.

Ricky: Yeah, and didn't we notice that this was a characteristic of some teachers who couldn't just start a statement. They had to say uh-huh, ok, or something, like it got them going.

Sheila: Yeah.

Ricky: Now what's the response "I", then. We've moved from "N"... to traveling...now to an "I". It started out as 3, now it's an "I", accepts ideas. We changed the writing of it to accepts routine responses of students.

Don: Accepts and uses routine responses of students.

Ricky: Right.

Pat: OK. Like the St. Lawrence Seaway bit.

Lynn: "Yes, that's right."

Pat: Another thing, though, that I think we're going to have to take into consideration as this is being written up and being described in a manual to other people, is that we're going to have to describe, in some manner, the action that is going on in the film, because all of these ratings are...

Ricky: Visual.

Pat: Being done visually. It's not just a verbal thing. Which, as we talk about it - this is one of the things that makes it hard for us to decide, here and now, how we'd rate something.

Ricky: This is why I was completely helpless with Beulah's example; I didn't see it.

Pat: Uh-huh.

Ricky: Notice that we can all know what we're talking about if we can remember something that we've seen in a film. Then we know what we're talking about.

Pat: Uh-huh.

Ricky: Because we've all seen it. But just verbal reports...doesn't match what we're trying to do.

Jeanne: Except that the way she described it was pretty clear, even though we hadn't seen it...

Ricky: I couldn't tell...

Sheila: Well, the girl didn't look that enthusiastic when she said it, but she was very nice...you know, she didn't...

Ricky: Well, we each have our interpretations of... and so we're so far removed from...

Pat: I think the thing that we're coming to see out of this... or, I feel, myself, that I've come to realize more and more that you have to have a lot of information before you can make a judgment and that you need to see it. And that the differences in the way other people see things and relate it to you...well...

Ricky: Yeah. We'll do a great disservice to this whole business in using verbal report.

Sheila: Yeah. Well, if we had that demonstration film, that would solve that.

Don: Are you talking about using it for training?

Ricky: Yeah. And using it to publish an article on what we're doing. It's almost like we have to have "You can order the film, and see these" as the post-script to the whole article.

Don: Uh-huh.

Pat: I wonder if the manual shouldn't be sold only with a demonstration film?

Ricky: I think it has to be something like that.

Lynn: A lot of the research that I came across was saying that visual cues do not add much to verbal cues, but, I think that..

Don: All we can say is that they're wrong...

Pat: Yeah, they're wrong.

Ricky: Now, we've all come up with three different ratings we could give an "all right." We could give it an "N", we could give it a nothing and not rate it at all, or we could give it an "I". All right, there might be an instance where we could give it an "F".

Pat: Yeah, it's according to what the teacher looks like, what...

Ricky: Yeah, what if she said,..

Pat:....tone of voice,

Ricky: It's all right - we might have that an "F".

Pat: I think we need to get out examples from the films. Then we need to splice these films some way so that we can..

Don: Uh-huh...

Pat: ...run off - can you run off lots of copies of film to be sold with [illegible]nual?

Ricky: Sure.

Pat: ...and just insist that the film be sold with the manual.

Ricky: Well, let's go on and finish this so that we can get each of our categores up to date, and then I think Don's idea is the thing, from now on, to try to pick up examples.

Pat: Yeah.

Ricky: Because to go back over all those films when we have a whole lot more to look at, I just don't think...

Pat: Well, then, for the manual, can we, at the time we're watching the films, say, "we're going to use this for an example of such and such in the manual and mark the film in some way and later know that we can go back and get that section of film to be spliced into the demonstration

series?

Don: Well, yeah...we can say half-way through, or make a mark or something. That'd be the best way.

Pat: And then sell the manual and the film.

Ricky: Yeah.

Don: And then what you'd have to do is copy out, or splice out and copy the film, and then splice it back in.

Sheila: Yeah, that'd be a good way.

Ricky: On the starfish girl, I think we can get almost all of our categories..

Sheila: And the one about the content...

Don: Yeah, and we can point out that the content's incorrect. On the lobster cages.

Ricky: Let's go on to the next one and try to... the next one is, lectures? Questions is the next one. And it was number four, and we changed the 4 to a Q, and we had a lot of trouble with this because of finding that rhetorical questions could become critical, be a "C", could be "F", could be lectures, could be a lot of things. So we reserved "Q" for...

Don: Asking questions about content or procedure with the intent that the student respond.

Ricky: Right. And sometimes we'd find that we'd have a string of Q's where the teacher would ask a question, then realize that the class couldn't answer it, so she'd ask another question. And then as we went back, we found that this all really amounted to an "L", that she was

really lecturing, but remember that girl... we felt so sorry for her. And we kept saying should we give her Q's? But we decided finally these were Q's. She wanted an answer, and her not getting it didn't keep it from being a Q.

Pat: And the fact that we didn't have an R after it would indicate...

Ricky: Yeah.

Pat: ... that she wasn't getting much interaction.

Ricky: Yeah. What else about Q?

Pat: I think it's fairly well defined.

Sheila: Yeah, I don't think we have much trouble with Q's.

Pat: If the teacher wants an answer to the question...

Ricky: And as long as we don't throw rhetorical questions into Q we're ok.

Pat: One thing I think, too, in that definition, does it say, "is content oriented?" I think also we would rate it as a question if the teacher asked someone, "What are you looking out the window for?"

Sheila: No, I might give that a "C".

Ricky: I might give it an "F".

Pat: Yeah, that's right.

Don: Or, might even give it a "D".

Jeanne: Is there any way we could mark this when we've had a second thought about it.. I mean, when we've judged it one way, and all of a sudden we've realized it was something else.

Don: Not the way we've got it now.

Pat: I don't think this is important, anyway.

Don: I don't either. One of the main things to remember out of this whole rating business is the fact that important things show up, almost always, in certain kinds of patterns of responses, and within 15 minutes of film, you're going to see that pattern repeated enough times where if you miss it once, it doesn't really matter, anyway.

Ricky: Our next one was L. How does it read now?

Don: Just like it was. The only thing that we added to that was that the criterion for L is that it must be content relevent, even though it may be stated as a question, rhetorically.

Ricky: But the minute she's talking about something other than content it's not going to get an L rating.

Don: That's right. The next one is "C" - we've done "C" pretty much.

Sheila: The next one is H. We haven't done "H".

Ricky: Oh, there's also "D". I have trouble with this one. Because it can come in question form, it can sound like part of a lecture and you can miss it.

Jeanne: Now, when you realize you've missed it, isn't there some way you can draw a line and change to "D"?

Pat: No, you've just missed your rating.

Ricky: You've just missed a rating.

Pat: See, missing one rating isn't important, because the pattern... like if something is important with a person, it's going to come up over and over, so you're going to get it. And as we get more proficient as raters, most of this will iron out.

Ricky: But you know, I think the reason that I sometimes miss it is

that teachers sort of don't want to be giving directions, so they say it in a lecturing sort of tone.

Don: The idea that struck me as you were saying that, and this is strictly off the record, and probably ought to be off the tape, but maybe some things will come out of this in things that we see which are difficult to rate, just like this, is really poor teacher behavior, that teachers should be taught - when you give a direction, be sure that you make a clean break and give a direction that people can understand.

Pat: I think this is interesting in terms of how afraid we are of being authoritarian...

Ricky: Uh-huh.

Pat: You remember when we started showing the demonstration film we had rated and you kind of apologized to Frances for being authoritarian and said you were going to be it, anyway, and she said well, it's all right to be authoritarian; I'd hate to see a permissive major-general?

Ricky: Uh-huh.

Pat: Oh. Maybe when a teacher means to give directions she should be free to feel like it's all right to say, you know...

Don: Yeah, to give directions. Well, this brings up another interesting possibility...what would you predict?...that the kinds of teachers for whom inter-rater reliability is very high are going to be teachers who speak very clearly, give clear directions, etc., and will probably be rated very good teachers.

Pat: This is why, with kids, they're better off if their parents let them know what the expectations are.

Ricky: Yeah.

Sheila: Uh-huh.

Pat: And they know where to... you know, they're not confused. Whatever the expectations are, if the children know them, they do better.

Don: I guess what we have trouble rating is what children might have trouble...

Ricky: ...understanding.

Don: Yeah. So. I think that's interesting.

Ricky: Yeah. I guess I never had thought of this before, really.

Pat: I hadn't either.

Ricky: I guess that's why we liked the starfish girl. So now the student categories.

Don: The R response is routine pupil response solicited by the teacher, with little or no affect, etc., etc., etc., Behavior need not be seen, but must be heard.

Ricky: Yeah. Including recital of prepared material.

DISCUSSION OF "ER CONVENTION" - eager response, seen, then reading.

Ricky: The next response is "E" and we've defined it that it must be seen on the film - otherwise, no matter how enthusiastic it sounds, it's an "R".

Sheila: And then there's "V". Voluntary response teacher did not call for.

H. - not hostile, but just <u>attention lapse</u>.

W: any kind of non-verbal classroom work, test taking, silent reading.

K. pretty obvious. something wrong with film, sound, can't rate for

some reason or another.

Convention: Double line around K for stopping of film by raters.